

# Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/734,721

Applicant(s)

UMEMOTO, SEIJI

Examiner

Akm Enayet Ullah

Art Unit

2874

## All Participants:

(1) Akm Enayet Ullah.(2) Jerry T. Rahl.

Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_

(3) Mr. Nicolas E. Seckel.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 7 May 2003

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

## Type of Interview:



Telephonic



Video Conference

Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☒ Applicant's representative)Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

## Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

1-12

Claims discussed:

1-12

Prior art documents discussed:

*Tai et al (USPNO. 5,835,661)*

## Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
*See Continuation Sheet*

## Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
AKM ENAYET ULLAH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant's explained differences between the reference Tai et al and instant invention as claimed in claims 1-11. Examiner also pointed out why the independent claim 1 itself is not allowable and why it reads the instant invention as claimed in claim 1-11. Further, it was discussed that Claim 6 is objected to and would be allowable if written in independent form with all limitations of Claims 1 and 2.